<u>REMARKS</u>

The Office examined claims 1, 3-6, and 8-11 and rejected same. With this paper, the claims are unchanged.

Drawing amendment
================

A drawing amendment was submitted with the response to the previous Office action, and applicant notes that the Office Action Summary sheet (PTOL-326) refers only to the drawings filed on 16 Oct. 2003. Applicant requests that the Examiner indicate wither the proposed drawing amendment submitted with the previous response is acceptable. (The drawing amendment corrected an error in the drawing. An arrow on the data flow indicated as "Request Message" 42a is wrong in the figure as filed. The proposed drawing amendment corrects the error by reversing the direction of the arrow, so that the message is now indicated as being sent from the UE 10 to the P-CSCF 12a. Support for the correction is at page 8, ll. 11-12.)

Rejection of claims 1 and 6
================

At section 3 of the Office action, claims 1, 3-6, and 8-11 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over G. Camarillo (RFC 3486 dated February 2003) in view of Bergenlid *et al.* (US 2003/0156578).

The independent claims are claims 1 and 6.

In rejecting claim 1 (and later also claim 6), the Office asserts at section 4 that Camarillo teaches the invention as in claim 1 except for the request message being a register message and the response message being a 401 (unauthorized) message, and that Bergenlid makes up for such shortcomings, noting the teaching in Bergenlid of the conventional use of a register message and an unauthorized message. That is, the Office notes that Beregenlid teaches only a mobile terminal sending a SIP

Register message (via a primary PDP context and corresponding bearers) to an IP Multimedia System (IMS) and the IMS responding with a SIP 401 Unauthorized message if the user is not registered, the 401 message being sent to the use with a challenge (citing par. [0048] of Bergenlid). The Office action then asserts that it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of Camarillo according to the teachings of Bergenlid to "include [*sic*] the request message is [*sic*] a register message, and the response message is [*sic*] a 401 (unauthorized) message since such methods were conventionally employed in the art to allow the system to detect, challenge and identify authorized/unauthorized subscribers (mobile terminals or users) before initiating a communications session." Applicant respectfully submits that although the use of a register message and the above-noted response is well-known, what is not taught or suggested by either Bergenlid or Camarillo is a UE examining a response to a register message in order to determine what compression technique is supported by an SIP outbound proxy, as recited in claim 1. Applicant does not see in the cited references any suggestion or teaching of a UE examining a response to a register message sent to a SIP outbound proxy server in order to determine a compression technique supported by the SIP outbound proxy server.

The Office notes that Camarillo teaches, at section 4.1, paragraph 4, that an outbound proxy server can provide an alternative SIP URI with a compression parameter "comp=sigcomp" in a Contact header field in a 200 OK response to an OPTIONS request message and the client can use this URI with the compression parameter "comp=sigcomp" for subsequent communications with this outbound proxy server using compression. The Office asserts that such a teaching is encompassed by the recitation in claim 1 that the UE device analyzes a response message receive from the SIP outbound proxy server in response to

the request message to determine an allowed corm of compression.
Applicant respectfully submits that the subject recitation, in
view of the limitations added to claim 1--i.e. that the request
message is a register message--is in effect that the UE device
analyzes a response message received from the SIP outbound proxy
server in response to *a register* message to determine an allowed
corm of compression. Now Bergenlid teaches only the (ordinary)
use of a register message, and not that a register is used to
provoke a response that is then examined to determine
compression, and Camarillo also fails to teach examining a
response to a register message to determine compression. Thus,
applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not
teach all the elements of the invention, and accordingly,
applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claim 1
(and also claim 6) under 35 USC §103 be reconsidered and
withdrawn, and also the rejections of the other claims, by virtue
of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the
claims of the application are in condition for allowance and
their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's
attorney urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present
response if anything in the present response is unclear or
unpersuasive.

Respectfully submitted,

Oct. 11, 2005
Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
 & ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

James A. Retter
Registration No. 41,266

tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955

-6-